

The 27th July, 1982

No. 9(1)-82-6Lab/6609.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Pemco Industry, 21, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 515 of 1980

between

SHRI SOHAN LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PEMCO INDUSTRY,
21, INDUSTRIAL AREA, YAMUNA NAGAR

Shri Inder Sain, for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chand, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 515 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/YMN/1788/54930, dated 27th October, 1980, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Sohan Lal, workman and the management of M/s. Pemco Industry, 21, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Sohan Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 21st July, 1981. On 8th April, 1982 both the parties made a statement that they have settled the dispute mutually. The representative of the respondent states that they have settled the matter mutually and according to that settlement the management will pay Rs. 700 in full and final settlement of his all claim upto date. He further stated that the management has also agreed to re-employ the concerned workman and the workman would join his duty within 15 days. He further stated that the workman would be given a fresh appointment letter, but his services would not be terminated without following the procedure of termination as laid down in the Industrial Disputes Act with regard to a permanent employee. This statement of the representative of the respondent was also agreed to by the representative of the workman.

On believing the statement of the parties, I hold that the parties have mutually settled the dispute and now there is no dispute between the party.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated the 23rd June, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1437, dated 26th June, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-82-6Lab/6655.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Roller (P) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 15/1982

between

SHRI GIR RAJ SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHAGWAN
DASS GHAI AND SONS RE-ROLLER (P) LTD., PLOT NO. 25, SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD

Present:

Shri Duli Chand, for the management.

Nemo, for the workman.

AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Gir Raj Singh, and the management of M/s Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Roller (P) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector 6, Faridabad, by order No. ID/FD/120/81/1371, dated 8th January, 1982, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of Shri G. Raj Singh was justified and in order? If so, what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties who appeared and the case was fixed for filing the written statement. On the date fixed, the management was present but the workman did not appear. The case was ordered to be dismissed for non-prosecution by the workman. I, therefore, dismiss the case for non-prosecution by the workman.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 25th June, 1982.

Endorsement No. 701, dated the 26th June, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-82-6Lab./6657.— In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Rollers (P) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector 6, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 13/1982

between

SHRI SOHAN PAL-I, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHAGWAN
DASS GHAI AND SONS RE-ROLLERS (P) LTD., PLOT NO. 25, SECTOR 6 FARIDABAD

Present:

Shri Duli Chand, for the management.

Nemo, for the workman.

AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Sohan Pal-I and the management of Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Rollers (P) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector 6, Faridabad, by order No. ID/FD/120/81/1357, dated the 8th January, 1982, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sohan Pal-I was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties who appeared and the case was fixed for the filing the written statement. On the date fixed, the management was present but the workman did not appear. The case was ordered to be dismissed for non-prosecution by the workman. I, therefore, dismiss the case for non-prosecution by the workman.

Dated the 25th June, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 699, dated the 26th June, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-82-6Lab./6659.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Rollers (P.) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector 6, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 17 of 1982

between

SHRI RAJBIR SINGH-I, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BHAGWAN
DASS GHAI AND SONS RE-ROLLERS (P.) LTD., PLOT NO. 25
SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD

Present:

Shri Dulj Chand, for the management.
Nemo, for the workman.

AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Rajbir Singh-I and the management of M/s. Bhagwan Dass Ghai and Sons Re-Rollers (P.) Ltd., Plot No. 25, Sector 6, Faridabad by order No. 1D/FD/120/81/1385, dated 8th January, 1982, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Rajbir Singh-I was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties, who appeared and the case was fixed for filing the written statement. On the date fixed the management was present but the workman did not appear. The case was ordered to be dismissed for non-prosecution by the workman. I, therefore, dismiss the case for non-prosecution by the workman.

Dated the 25th June, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No 700, dated the 26th June, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.